

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00524 101203Z

11

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 DODE-00

NSC-05 /089 W

----- 073724

P R 101120Z NOV 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1266

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T MBFR VIENNA 0524

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET REPRESENTATIVES OF NOV 6, 1975

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: US REP, DEPREP AND JCS REP HAD DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET REPS KHLESTOV, SMIRNOVSKY AND KAPITONOV ON NOVEMBER 6 AT SOVIET REQUEST. KHLESTOV SAID HE WANTED TO DISCUSS THE QUESTION OF HOW TO DECIDE THE SO-CALLED THIRD PRINCIPLE. HE DID NOT DISCUSS THIS PRINCIPLE IN THE ABSTRACT BUT DISCUSSED IT AS IT APPLIED TO THE THREE TYPES OF FORCES IN DISPUTE: SURFACE-TO-SURFACE MISSILES, HELICOPTERS AND GROUND-BASED TERRITORIAL AIR DEFENSE. HE ARGUED FORCEFULLY THAT A PARTICULAR CATEGORY OF PERSONNEL SHOULD BE ALLOCATED TO THE SAME FORCE CATEGORY REGARDLESS OF THE NUMBER OF PERSONNEL INVOLVED, AND THEN THE CASE THAT ALL SSM AND HELICOPTER PERSONNEL SHOULD BE ALLOCATED TO

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00524 101203Z

GROUND FORCES AND TERRITORIAL AIR DEFENSE TO AIR FORCES.

END SUMMARY.

2. US REP SAID IT WAS IMPORTANT, WHEN DISCUSSING A FORCE DEFINITION, NOT TO DEAL ONLY WITH DIVIDING GROUND FROM AIR FORCES BUT TO DISCUSS A TOTAL DEFINITION INCLUDING THE INTRODUCTORY SECTION ON COMPREHENSIVENESS AND EXCLUSIONS. IN ANSWER TO KHLESTOV'S QUESTION AS TO WHY THE WEST INSISTED ON DATA FOR DISCUSSION OF THE THREE DISPUTED CASES, US REP SAID: (A) THE WEST WANTS TO BE SURE THAT BOTH SIDES ARE TALKING ABOUT THE SAME UNITS AND PERSONNEL; (B) THE WEST HAS ALREADY ALLOCATED FORCES BETWEEN THE TWO GROUPS; IN ORDER TO DECIDE WHETHER IT IS APPROPRIATE TO MAKE ANY CHANGE, THE SIZE OF THAT CHANGE HAS TO BE QUANTIFIED; (C) IN VIEW OF EASTERN REFUSAL TO GIVE DATA THUS FAR, WESTERN AUTHORITIES ARE UNDERSTANDABLY RELUCTANT TO AGREE TO ABSTRACT VERBAL CHANGES IN DEFINITION.

3. KHLESTOV PROCEEDED TO MAKE A MORE DETAILED CASE FOR ALLOCATION OF THE DISPUTED FORCES, ARGUING THAT GROUND-BASED AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL COULD LOGICALLY BE DIVIDED INTO TWO GROUPS, ONE WHICH PROVIDED TROOP AIR DEFENSE AND A SECOND WHICH PROVIDED TERRITORIAL AIR DEFENSE. HE SAID THE FIRST GROUP SHOULD BE ALLOCATED TO GROUND, THE SECOND TO AIR. HE SAID THE PRESENT WESTERN ALLOCATION OF A PORTION OF WARSAW PACT GROUND-BASED TERRITORIAL AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL TO GROUND FORCES WHILE COMPARABLE NATO PERSONNEL WERE ALLOCATED TO AIR WAS UNJUSTIFIABLE AND INEQUITABLE.

4. US REP REITERATED THE NEED FOR DATA, IN ORDER TO SHOW THAT THE SO-CALLED THIRD PRINCIPLE WOULD NOT ITSELF SETTLE THE DISPUTED CASES, AND POINTED OUT THAT IT MIGHT BE MORE LOGICAL TO PUT ALL TERRITORIAL GROUND-BASED AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL IN THE AIR FORCES THAN IN THE GROUND FORCES.

5. THE DISCUSSION WAS INCONCLUSIVE, BUT TWO POINTS EMERGED: (A) KHLESTOV CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD THAT THERE COULD BE NO DISCUSSION OF DEFINITIONS WITHOUT DISCUSSION OF THE INTRO-
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00524 101203Z

DUCTORY SECTION AND THAT THE WEST WAS NOT WILLING TO DECIDE ON THE DISPOSITION OF DISPUTED CASES WITHOUT DATA; (B) KHLESTOV AT NO POINT INSISTED THAT HIS POINT 3 SHOULD BE TREATED IN THE ABSTRACT OR SHOULD HAVE A SEPARATE PLACE IN AN AGREED DEFINITION; BUT HE PUSHED FOR SPECIFIC DISPOSITION OF THE THREE DISPUTED CASES ON THE BASIS OF THE THIRD PRINCIPLE.

6. BEGIN FYI: WHEN US REP MADE POINT ABOUT LACK OF
LOGIC OF EASTERN POSITION IN PUTTING ALL GROUND-BASED
TERRITORIAL AIR DEFENSE PERSONNEL IN AIR FORCES, KHLESTOV
SAID HE WOULD BE WILLING TO CONSIDER PUTTING ALL INTO
GROUND AND WOULD DEVOTE FURTHER THOUGHT TO THIS POS-
SIBILITY. HE ADDED THAT TO DO SO WOULD PROBABLY
BE MORE COMPLICATED. END FYI.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: AIR DEFENSE, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS, DIPLOMATIC DISCUSSIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 10 NOV 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: greeneet
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975MBFRV00524
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750390-0197
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19751159/aaaacarf.tel
Line Count: 122
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: greeneet
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 03 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <03 APR 2003 by ShawDG>; APPROVED <17 SEP 2003 by greeneet>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET REPRESENTATIVES OF NOV 6, 1975
TAGS: PARM, US, UR, NATO
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006